

COPY MADE

07 JUL 2009

Document Delivery  
The University of Sydney Library

## AUFSÄTZE

### **Iliad 4.188-213: P.Alex. inv. 80 + P.Berol. inv. 7119 Col. I**

With Plate I

Michael J. Apthorp (University of Queensland)

P.Alex. inv. 80  
Hitherto unpublished

Height: 20.4 cm; width: 8 cm

Papyrus roll  
Third century A.D.

P.Berol. inv. 7119

Height: 20.5 cm; width: 9.5 cm

Fayum

Acquired in 1891 from the Brugsch Collection

Both fragments form part of the roll containing P.Berol. inv. 7116 + 7117 + 7119 = Iliad Pap. 42 Allen = Pack<sup>2</sup> 707, first publ. by description and brief collation BKT V.1.3, republ. Poethke (below, n. 3). The single Alexandrian fragment will be combined with the three Berlin fragments to form Mertens-Pack<sup>3</sup> 707.

In 1964 the Catalogue of the Greek papyri in the Graeco-Roman Museum of Alexandria was published by A. Swiderek and M. Vandoni (= P.Alex.). Here (p. 17) a brief note was included on the unidentified contents of P.Alex. inv. 80, stating merely that this very fragmentary text contained the slender remains of 22 lines. In 1986 a team from the International Photographic Archive of Papyri visited Alexandria and photographed the Greek papyri there, including P.Alex. inv. 80;<sup>1</sup> prints of the literary papyri were then deposited in the CEDOPAL photographic archive at the University of Liège, where Odette Bouquiaux-Simon soon succeeded in identifying our papyrus as containing Iliad 4.188-213.<sup>2</sup> But at first her 1991 article remained unknown to most Homerists: although it was indexed in the Papyrology section of APh 64, 1993 (as No. 64-08109), there was unfortunately no cross-reference to it in the Homer section. But in 1998 W. Clarysse published his valuable CD-ROM the Leuven Database of Ancient Books, which did indeed incorporate the newly identified P.Alex. inv. 80 into its files, as LDAB 1998.2403. By a happy coincidence this was also the year in which G. Poethke replaced the sparse 1907 BKT collation of P.Berol. inv. 7116 + 7117 + 7119 with a de luxe edition complete with photographs and full

<sup>1</sup> See W. Van Rengen and A. Bülow-Jacobsen, ZPE 66, 1986, 99-101.

<sup>2</sup> Revue informatique et statistique dans les sciences humaines 27, 1991, 41-7, esp. 46 No. 6; she transcribed only the beginnings of the first two lines.

transcriptions:<sup>3</sup> the three Berlin fragments include not only Iliad 4.27-53 (inv. 7116), 137-87 (inv. 7117) and the beginnings of 214-38 (inv. 7119 Col. II) but also (inv. 7119 Col. I) the ends of 188-213, the very lines whose middles are covered by the newly identified P.Alex. inv. 80. When I had obtained a preliminary photocopy of the CEDOPAL print of P.Alex. from Paul Mertens it immediately struck me that the rather idiosyncratic hand was remarkably similar to that of the Berlin fragments – in fact, as I soon realized, identical – and that the size and layout of the two fragments were also compatible with the supposition that they both came from the same roll. This conclusion was soon confirmed by my Brisbane colleague John Whitehorne and by Günter Poethke in Berlin. After ascertaining that Mme Bouquiaux-Simon was not planning to publish the full text of the Alexandrian papyrus herself, I decided to undertake the task myself – a task which would have been impossible without the kind and expert help of colleagues in Brisbane, Belgium and Berlin.<sup>4</sup>

My purpose here is simply to publish the full text of the Alexandrian fragment for the first time and to link it to its Berlin twin, P.Berol. inv. 7119.<sup>5</sup> The left-hand edge of this column (Iliad 4.188-213) is still lost; the middle is contained in the Alexandrian fragment; then a section to the right of P.Alex. is also lost, of varying width but usually perhaps around 4.6 cm; and finally the ends of the lines appear in the Berlin fragment – or rather, the ends of most of them: seven of the shorter ones end before they reach P.Berol. It will be seen, then, that although the Alexandrian fragment shares a column with the Berlin fragment, the two fragments do not actually touch at any point.

It follows, of course, that P.Alex. itself has neither a left nor a right margin. It does, however, have an upper margin of up to 1.6 cm and a lower margin of up to 1 cm.

Our scribe writes parallel to the fibres in a left-leaning hand which has been dated by Poethke, as it was by Schubart and Wilamowitz, the editors of BKT V.1, to the third century A.D. Both Poethke and the BKT editors comment that the text contains many mistakes, of which only a few have been corrected: this feature will also be found to characterize P.Alex. Iota adscript is sometimes written by our scribe (e.g. τῳι in line 208), sometimes not (e.g. αγειρουση for ἀγειρούση).

<sup>3</sup> G. Poethke, APF 44, 1998, 2-7 with Plates II, III and IV, henceforth = "Poethke".

<sup>4</sup> My heartfelt thanks to Prof. Paul Mertens, the founder of CEDOPAL, for his valuable and friendly help; to Mme Marie-Hélène Marganne, the present Director of CEDOPAL, for sending me both a digitalized and a conventional photographic print of this fragment, the latter of which is published here alongside that of P.Berol. inv. 7119 (Plate I); to Dr John Whitehorne, for helping me to improve my first transcription; to Prof. Jean Bingen, for his help and encouragement; and above all to Prof. Günter Poethke, for his generosity, courtesy and patience: the improvements he has made to my draft are substantial, though for whatever faults may remain I retain sole responsibility. The photograph of the Alexandrian fragment was taken by Prof. Wilfried Van Rengen and is reproduced here by courtesy of the International Photographic Archive of Papyri.

<sup>5</sup> Thus the right-hand column of P.Berol. inv. 7119 (= Col. II Poethke), covering the beginnings of Iliad 4.214-38, will be given little attention here as it is not directly linked to P.Alex. inv. 80 and has already been competently transcribed and annotated by Poethke (pp. 6-7).

in line 28 in P.Berol. inv. 7116); but it is also interpolated in a few places where it does not belong (e.g. εἰη for εῖη in line 189). There do not seem to be any accents or breathings anywhere in the roll. A few apostrophes are to be found in the Berlin fragments, and probably one in P.Alex. (line 211).

The Alexandrian fragment is in a poor state of preservation. Even within its modest compass there are substantial lacunae; for many letters only slight traces of ink remain; and sometimes the fibres have been thrown out of their original alignment in such a way as to make identification of letters problematic. For example, the κ of Λυ]κιων in 207 may not at first glance look much like a normal κ, but after closer inspection the movement undergone by two tiny ink-bearing slivers from their original positions becomes apparent. But unfortunately the precise nature of similar small-scale fibre-movements is not usually as easy to discern from the photograph as it is here.

Apart from its many obvious mistakes – most of them merely orthographic – P.Alex. contains only one or two previously unattested variants worthy of even cursory consideration: των for τῶι in 207 and maybe (if my tentative restoration is correct) ἀμει]νονος for ἀμόμονος in 194. But a little reflection will show that these are highly unlikely to represent what Homer actually sang.

Of some interest is the way P.Alex. has indirectly helped us to decide between the relative merits of the two very different transcriptions of the ending of line 208 in P.Berol. that have been published so far, both of them in 1998.

However, by far the most interesting and important feature of P.Alex. is its omission of lines 196-7: the scribe passes straight from 195 to 198. Poethke had already correctly concluded (p. 3), on the basis of the preserved portions of P.Berol. inv. 7119, that 196-7 were “probably” (“wahrscheinlich”) omitted by the scribe, as in some other sources; now, with the fuller picture presented by P.Alex., we can change that “probably” to “certainly”.<sup>6</sup> These two lines are absent from all three of our other early papyri (though they are indeed present in one late papyrus of “Byzantine” date), and they are also absent from some of our mediaeval MSS; there can be no doubt that they are an interpolation. It is wrong to suppose, with many scholars even today, that all three lines 195-7 must have been present in Aristarchus’ text because he (allegedly) marked them all with obeli: in fact the evidence shows that he obelized only 195, as the scholia state: Schol. A (Aristo-

<sup>6</sup> In the Berlin fragment there is space for only two lines between the endings καλε]σσον (193) and ακουσ]ας (198). Thus one might perhaps wonder whether Poethke’s “wahrscheinlich” was excessively cautious. And yet he was technically correct. On the one hand, on the basis of *his* evidence, one could point out that 197 must certainly be *one* of the absent lines, because if it had been present its ending would certainly have been visible, since it would have projected far beyond the left-hand edge of P.Berol., as it does when the same line occurs below as 207, and that therefore the couplet omitted could not be either 194-5 or 195-6; but on the other hand it would have been theoretically possible for there to have been two *single-line* omissions, of 197 and *either* 194 *or* 195. But now, with the publication of P.Alex., that possibility is excluded, since *both* 194 *and* 195 are clearly shown to be present there. Moreover, the remains in P.Alex. of the three lines immediately following 195 are compatible with 198-200 but not with 196-8.

nicus) on 195: ὄφρα ἴδῃ Μενέλαον· ὁ ἀστερίσκος καὶ ὁ ὀβελός, not οἱ ἀστερίσκοι καὶ οἱ ὀβελοί, and similar wording in the singular in the parallel scholium on 205. The theory that we should reword (or at least reinterpret) in the plural was formulated at a time when no manuscript evidence against 196-7 was yet known, and this theory continued to prevail for a long time even after such evidence had come to light because the significance of that evidence was not yet appreciated, but after Bolling had proved that weak attestation of a passage by our MSS and post-Aristarchean papyri indicates its absence from the edition of Aristarchus<sup>7</sup> there remained little excuse for such ignorance. Of course the reason why Aristarchus athetized 195 but not 196-7 was because 196-7 were not present in his text at all: in all probability they were completely unknown to him and made their debut centuries after his death; but if he did come across them at all he would not have omitted them completely except on the basis of overwhelming evidence against them in *his* MSS.<sup>8</sup>

Further evidence for the absence of 196-7 from the edition of Aristarchus can be found in the A, bT and D scholia and in the marginal signs of the Venetus A. While 205 has an asterisk attached to it in A, there are no asterisks attached to 206-7, as there should have been if Aristarchus had athetized the identical 196-7; and the marginal signs attached to 195-7 are in a state of confusion, with obeli attached to 195 and 197 but not to 196. The scribe has obviously made a belated, half-hearted and inconsistent attempt to align his marginal signs with his text, which included 196-7. Aristarchus and Aristonicus (Schol. A) comment on 206 but have nothing to say about the identical 196; Nicanor (Schol. A) comments on 207 but not on the identical 197; the bT exegetic scholium 207a Erbse would likewise be expected to occur earlier, at the identical 197, if its author had known that line; and there are no D scholia on 196-7 but ample D scholia on the identical 206-7 – inexplicable unless the archetype of these scholia was based on a text that lacked 196-7.

Bolling in fact dealt explicitly with our passage on various occasions between 1914 and 1950:<sup>9</sup> not only did he adduce most of the arguments given above (and some others, equally valid), but in 1916, with uncanny prescience, he queried the natural interpretation of the BKT editors' collation, viz. that lines 196-7 were *present* in P.Berol. inv. 7119 – for Schubart and Wilamowitz had failed to record that between 193 and 198 there was space for only two lines, and that the two missing lines were likely to be 196-7, which by then (1907) were known to be absent from some other papyri and MSS. Bolling's reservations were expressed most clearly in 1916 – “Δ 196-7 ... seem to stand in P.Berol. 7119; the column is

however I  
summary  
whenever  
suspicion  
and further  
result is t  
stronger.  
evidence  
in Alexar  
question,  
of some c

In the  
the papy  
though I  
(1931), J  
Vol. I 19  
J. La Re  
followed  
scribe ha  
into acco  
dubious.  
hasten to  
their let  
divergen  
matic ev  
exhausti  
own coll

Iliad 4.188

1

1

1

<sup>7</sup> G.M. Bolling, *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*, Oxford 1925, esp. 3-30, and his earlier contributions listed there on p. 7.

<sup>8</sup> See my *Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*, Heidelberg 1980, esp. Chs. I, III and IV.

<sup>9</sup> AJPh 35, 1914, 138; AJPh 37, 1916, 12, 20, 26; *External Evidence* (above, n. 7) 17; *The Athetized Lines of the Iliad*, Baltimore 1944, 16, 20, 21, 91-2; *Ilias Atheniensium*, Lancaster (Pennsylvania) 1950, ad loc.

however fragmentary, and it is possible that an omission has not been noted in the summary publication that has been made"<sup>10</sup> – but they were repeated more briefly whenever he returned to the lines. Now, 82 years after Bolling first voiced his suspicions, Poethke's full publication of the Berlin papyrus has proved him right, and further confirmation is provided here by our Alexandrian fragment. The end result is that the evidence against the authenticity of the lines has become even stronger. Aristarchus would doubtless have been gratified to learn that reliable evidence of at least part of his text of Homer would emerge from a new Museum in Alexandria over two millennia after his death. Much more could be said on this question, and indeed I plan to return to it elsewhere – though more precise details of some of the main diplomatic evidence will be given below *ad loc.*

In the commentary following the transcription below I have collated the text of the papyrus with that of the new Teubner edition by M.L. West (Vol. I 1998), though I have also consulted the editions of H. van Thiel (1996), T.W. Allen (1931), J. van Leeuwen / M.B. Mendes da Costa (1906) and W. Leaf (2nd edn. Vol. I 1900), as well as the old Teubner editions of A. Ludwich (Vol. I 1902) and J. La Roche (Vol. I 1873). When supplementing lacunae I have mechanically followed West's text, except where there is a specific reason to suspect that the scribe had something different. Mainly this means that the spacing has been taken into account, even though the quality of such indirect testimony is often somewhat dubious. The spacing criterion must be used with especial caution as the lines hasten towards their ends, where there is a tendency for the longish lines to crowd their letters together, though not to an extent that is entirely predictable. All divergences from West's text will be pointed out in the commentary. The diplomatic evidence gathered in the editions of West and others will not be presented in exhaustive detail but rather analytically, though in a few places I have used my own collations to correct or supplement published findings.

*Iliad* 4.188-213

P.Alex. inv.80 Plate I

P.Berol. inv. 7119 Col. I

Margin

- 188 [τον δ] απαμειβομεν[ος] πρ[οσεφη κρειω]ν Αγαμεμνων  
[αι γαρ δ]η ουτως ειηι φιλος [ω Μενελαε]  
190 [ελκος δ]ε ειητηρ επιμασ[εται ηδ επιθησει]  
[φαρμαχ] α κεν παυσιοιο με[λαιναων οδυ]γαων  
[η και Ταλθυβι]ον [θ]ειον κηρ[υκα προσηυδα]  
[Ταλθυβι] οτι ταχιστα Μ[α]χαο[να δευρο καλε]σσον  
[φωτ Ασ]κληπιου υιον αμει[νονος ιητηρος]  
195 [οφρα ιδηι Με]γελαν α[ρ]ηιον [αρχον Αχαιων]  
198 [ως εφαι ο]υ[δ] αρα ο[ι] κη[ρυξ απιθησεν ακουσ]ας  
[βη δ ιεναι κατα λαον Αχ]αιω[ν χαλκοχιτω]νων  
200 [παπταινων ηρωα Μα]χαο[ν α τον δ ενοησεν]  
[εσταοτ αμφι δε μιν κρατεραι στιχες ασπι]σταων

<sup>10</sup> AJPh 37, 1916, 20.

- [λαων οι οι εποντο Τρικης εξ ιποβοτο]ιο  
 [αγχου δ ισταμενος επεα] π[τεροεντα προσ]ηυδα  
 [ορσ Ασκληπια]δ[η καλ]εξε[ι] κρ[ειων Αγαμεμν]ων  
 205 [οφρα ιδηι Με]νελαον αρηιον [αρχον Αχαιων]  
 [ον τις οιστε]υσας εβαλεν τ[οξων ευ ειδω]ς  
 [Τρων η Λυ]κιων των μεν [κλεος αμμι] δε πεν[θ]ος  
 [ως φατο τ]ωι δ αρα θυμον εγ[ι στηθεσ]σιν εδυνε  
 [βαν δ ιεν]αι καθ ομειλ[ο]ν [ανα στρατο]ν ε[υ]ρυν Αχαιων  
 210 [αλλ οτε] δη ρ εικανον ο[θι] ξ[ανθος Μενελ]αος  
 [βλημεν]ος ην περι δ α[υτον α]γηγεραθ[ι]· οσοι αριστοι  
 [κυκλος ο δ εν] μεσσοισι π[αριστατο ισοθ]εος φως  
 [αυτικα δ εκ ζ]ωστηρος [αρηροτος ελκεν ο]ειστον  
 Margin

**Top margin** I can make nothing of any of the small dark ink-like markings here. Perhaps they are merely dirt, stray ink-marks or both. Most prominent are those above the letters βο in the first line; they do not seem to be in the right position to be the remains of a column-number.

**188** The mu of ἀπαμειβομεν[ος] has a couple of strange bulges disfiguring part of its left half. The scribe may have started writing a false letter, immediately realized his mistake, deleted it, and then decided to recycle the resulting mess by making it serve as the left half of his mu.

**189** For the superfluous iota in ειηι cf. the same scribe's εγερθηι in 152 and εθελωι (subjunctive) in 41.

**190** For the scriptio plena δ]ε cf. the same scribe's επδε αταρ in line 29. For the spelling ειητηρ (for ιητήρ) cf. our scribe's ειρηι (sic!) for ιρή in 164, κ[α]ιρειω for καιρίωι in 185, and, below, ομειλ[ο]ν (209), εικανον (210) and ο]ειστον (213). Cf. F.T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, Vol. I, Milan 1976, 189-91.

**191** Our pap. rightly has κεν here (six mediaeval MSS of no particular distinction have περ; see esp. Allen ad loc.).

παυσιοις: this is of course a vox nihili. The sigma is a broken letter and could perhaps be an epsilon, and the final omicron could just possibly be a sigma – but neither παυειοιο nor παυειοις nor παυσιοις would do anything to improve the sense. Nearly all our sources, including Aristarchus (Schol. Δ 191b Erbse, from Aristonicus) and West's Pap. 958 (for which see on 196-7 below), have either παύσηισι or παύσησι: most editors print the former, West the latter. One MS, Allen's Vi2 (s. xv), has either παύση σε or παύση σε (citations differ), and another, West's O (s. xiii), has σε above the line (perhaps, indeed, as a variant or correction, but may it not be as exegesis?), and van Leeuwen actually prints παύσηι σε in his text; but whether or not this is what Homer sang, it seems unlikely to be what the scribe of P.Alex. wrote, uncertain though his text is at this point.

194

The de  
presum  
the right  
of the i  
Homer  
paralle  
mechar  
a sort o  
better  
Greek)  
Macha  
formul  
suppos  
αμει[μ  
possib  
of ει (c  
case w  
cases o  
very c  
one ur

195

well s  
205; a  
varian  
and co  
more

196

pleasi  
The li

A.J

lat  
on  
ch  
Stu

Pr

PP

Li

centu

**194** ἀμει[νονος; otherwise unattested; the rest of the paradosis has ἀμόμονος. The dotted letters are far from secure; in particular, the extremely vestigial presumed remains of the iota may be merely dirt of the type visible elsewhere at the right-hand edge of the fragment, e.g. below line 199. But one can find no sign of the upsilon of ἀμόμονος in these traces, and there is confusion elsewhere in the Homeric paradosis between ἀμόμων and ἀμείνων: *Odyssey* 9.414 (the closest parallel), *Iliad* 6.350, 7.358, 12.232. If the restoration is correct, it can only be a mechanical error of the type seen in the parallel cases just listed: although sense of a sort could perhaps be extracted from ἀμείνονος ("son of Asclepius, an [even] better healer"), this would be very forced (there is no word for "even" in the Greek) and unsuited to the context, which needs to stress the competence of Machaon himself (cf. the bT scholium ad loc.); and ἀμόμονος is supported by the formulaic parallels at *Iliad* 11.518 and 835. An alternative solution would be to suppose that we do have a version of ἀμόμονος here, but one mis-spelt as ἀμει[νονος] (ει for υ: Gignac, op. cit., 272, foot, cf. 267-8): this would be possible, but it does not seem particularly likely, since (a) the simple substitution of ει or ι for υ is not very common at this period, and (b) there is no other clear case where our scribe has made this particular mistake: in all 22 other relevant cases of simple Homeric υ he writes υ, not ει or ι (I exclude from the count the very confused centre of line 147, where an examination of the photograph leaves one uncertain exactly what the scribe has done and why).

**195** At the end of 195 the variants ἀρχὸν Ἀχαιῶν and Ἀτρεὺς υἱόν are both well supported by our sources, and the same is true of the same two variants in 205; a lively debate has emerged in recent years about the relative merits of each variant in each place, but unfortunately the endings of both lines fall in lacunae and considerations of space can tell us nothing about which variant our scribe is more likely to have written in either place.

**196-7** As explained in my introduction above, these two interpolated lines are, pleasingly, absent from our text, whose scribe passed straight from 195 to 198. The lines are also omitted by the following three papyri:

(a) P.Aberdeen 106 = Pap. 173 Collart = Pack<sup>2</sup> 714 (early first century A.D.).

(b) P.Cair. G.H. 10443 = Pap. 172 Collart = Pack<sup>2</sup> 716 (second or perhaps late first century A.D.: I follow the dating given by Odette Bouquiaux-Simon on p. 30 of her de luxe edition of this papyrus, "Pack<sup>2</sup> 716: un fragment du chant Δ de l'Iliade au Musée du Caire", *Bulletin of the Center of Papyrological Studies* [Ain Shams University, Cairo] Vol. 1, 1985, 29-36).

(c) P.Oxy. 3.544 = Pap. 24 Allen = Pack<sup>2</sup> 715 = "P.Cornell VIII" in N.E. Priest, *Homeric Papyri in the Michigan Collection*, Ann Arbor 1975, No. 12, pp. 64-6 (third century A.D.).

Lines 196-7 are also omitted by a small minority of the MSS from each of the centuries from the twelfth to the fifteenth. In addition, line 197 *alone* (i.e. with

196 present) is omitted by West's (= van Thiel's) Y (s. xi) and also by Allen's P10 (s. xii-xiii), M7 (s. xiii) and V11 (s. xiii). This could indicate either that the interpolation was made in two separate stages (first 196 alone, later 197 as well) or that from the outset the whole couplet was interpolated but as the interpolation spread by contaminatio some scribes noticed and inserted only a single additional line. The fact that West's late papyrus already contains both lines (see below) may make the latter hypothesis seem a little more likely.

Which MSS *contain* the lines? The earliest is West's Pap. 958, said to be of "Byzantine" date: it is one of the unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyri in the Ashmolean Museum, = P.Ashm. inv. 6 1B 13/B(a) (see M.L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, Munich and Leipzig 2001, pp. 87 and 119). It is of course significant that, of the five extant papyri covering this passage, the only one to contain 196-7 is by far the latest – a fact which supports the hypothesis that the lines have been interpolated into a text that originally lacked them. Of our two tenth-century MSS, A and D, A contains the lines and D is not extant at this point (but its twelfth-century supplement for Books 1-4, Allen's d, *omits* the lines). Of our six eleventh-century MSS five contain the lines (including the three MSS of the b family, West's B, C and E) and one, West's Y, contains only 196. Most of our twelfth-century MSS also contain the lines, as do the vast majority of the later MSS. Admittedly the early mediaeval MSS offer more support to the lines than to the average post-Aristarchean interpolation, but this is not surprising when we have an earlier-than-usual terminus ante quem for this particular interpolation (in the form of West's Byzantine papyrus).

West includes 196-7 in his text (without brackets) and has the entry "195-7 (= 205-7) ath. Ar[istarchus]" in his apparatus. The latter is factually incorrect (see my introduction above) and the former a surprising departure from his normally excellent judgment in such matters.

**200-203** The  $\nu$  of  $\text{Μαχάο}[\nu][\alpha$  in 200 survives on an isthmus of papyrus only 1 cm wide at the right-hand edge of P.Alex. A few mm below the  $\nu$  there is an almost complete break between the upper and lower halves of P.Alex., and at the right-hand edge the few remaining fibres seem to have become telescoped together. Thus while a casual glance might suggest that there was originally space for only one line between 200 and 203, this is an illusion created by the telescoping, as is confirmed by the presence of the endings of both 201 and 202 in P.Berol.

**205** The spacing tends to favour the restoration of the middle  $\text{ιδηι}$  (or  $\text{ιδη}$ ), read by Aristarchus and most of our early MSS (including Allen's twelfth-century V12, as my own collation shows, though Allen omits it from his list here), rather than the slightly longer active  $\text{ιδηις}$  (or  $\text{ιδης}$ ). Van Thiel, Ludwich and La Roche print the middle form, West, Allen, van Leeuwen and Leaf the active.

For  $[\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\nu\ \text{Αχαιών}]$  see on line 195 above.

**207** For the  $\kappa$  of  $\text{Λυ}[\kappa\iota\omega\nu]$  see the introduction above.  $\tau\omega\nu$  here (for  $\tau\omega\iota$  in the paradosis) seems to be an otherwise unattested variant, but it is best regarded as

no more  
and per  
would  
Howev  
technic

208

follows  
marks  
ησ in t  
scribe  
someti  
tion, h  
σ|τη'θ  
an unu  
exiguc  
perhap  
enterea  
tend to  
would  
photog  
letters  
salvag  
was oc  
and d  
ultima  
implied  
in P.B  
the li  
suppo  
of a ta  
sigma  
of all  
into tl  
then l  
the on  
in Poe  
letters  
found

11-

lacuna  
of στ  
extrem  
stroke



no more than a copyist's slip by assimilation to the two preceding genitive plurals and perhaps also the following plural ἄμμι. But if a plural were required here it would have to be τοῖς, to form an appropriate contrast with the dative ἄμμι. However, the singular τῶι is of course infinitely superior, referring back to the technically brilliant but sinisterly anonymous τις.

208 Poethke's 1998 publication transcribes the ending of this line in P.Berol. as follows: σ]τη'θε'σιν <ο>ρ<ι>νε. In his apparatus he explains that his insertion-marks around θε mean that these two letters have been written in above the letters ησ in the first word, σ]τησιν. At first glance this all seems plausible enough: our scribe is elsewhere prone to omit single letters or two-letter sequences, and sometimes he inserts them above the line, sometimes not. On further consideration, however, doubts and problems emerge: the supposed ι and ν at the end of σ]τη'θε'σιν are squeezed in very tight before the following supposed ρ; that ρ has an unusually stocky and rounded descender; and the traces of the supposed θε are exiguous enough to make alternative interpretations worth considering. But perhaps the main difficulty is thrown up by the spacing now that P.Alex. has entered the equation. If Poethke were right, a transcription of the whole line would tend to read: [ὡς φάτο τ]ῶι δ' ἀρὰ θυμὸν ἐν[ι σ]τη'θε'σιν <ο>ρ<ι>νε. But this would be impossible, because a study of the preceding and following lines in the photographs reveals that there would be space in the lacuna not for just the two letters posited but for about six more. Poethke's transcription could perhaps be salvaged if we were to suppose that the six-letter space in the middle of the lacuna was occupied by a six-letter mistake which the scribe noticed as he was writing and deleted there and then before proceeding. But a more economical and, ultimately, a more convincing hypothesis is at hand if we install the transcription implied by West in his Teubner edition *ad loc.* West reads the last word of the line in P.Berol. not as <ο>ρ<ι>νε but as ἐδύνε. This would imply a transcription along the lines of [ὡς φάτο τ]ῶι δ' ἀρὰ θυμὸν ἐν[ι σ]τηθεσσ]ιν ἐδύνε.<sup>11</sup> On this supposition the bold initial upright at the edge of P.Berol. is not the topless stem of a tau but an iota; the next letter is not an eta but a nu; next, we no longer have a sigma surmounted by a few surviving traces of a superscript θε but rather, in place of all this, simply a whole epsilon; next, the squeezed-together iota and nu turn into the (admittedly somewhat enigmatic) remains of a single letter, a delta; we then lose our rho with its bushy tail and gain in its place a upsilon very similar to the one almost immediately below in 209 ἐ[υ]ρυν; and finally we finish with νε as in Poethke. In this version our scribe improves his reputation by not omitting any letters at all, and the six missing letters in the middle of the lacuna have been found and restored without our needing to resort to the *ad hoc* hypothesis of a six-

<sup>11</sup> To avoid confusion I have thus far followed Poethke's marking of the right-hand edge of the lacuna. However, in the final transcription of 188-213 given above I have moved the third sigma of σ]τηθεσσ]ιν out of the brackets and into the attested text (thus: σ]τηθεσ]σιν), since at the extreme left-hand edge of P.Berol., to the left of and level with the base of the iota, there is a tiny stroke of ink which is presumably a relic of the end of the preceding sigma.

letter deletion. The only remaining difficulty (a slight one) lies in what I have called the “admittedly somewhat enigmatic” traces of the delta – but it is certainly possible to interpret them in this way, as West has done, and indeed no suitable alternative presents itself.

As for the merits of this variant, we could perhaps compare Iliad 19.366-7 ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ / δῶν ἄχος ἄτλητον – but it is one thing to say “unbearable grief entered his heart”, another to say “*he* entered his heart”: the reading is undoubtedly awkward. Nor do we find the expression θυμὸν ἔδυνε anywhere else in Homer. How, then, did the variant arise? It does not seem likely to be a simple misreading of ὄρινε (read by Aristarchus, two other papyri and virtually the entire *paradosis*). Astonishingly, the explanation may lie in the fact that, while θυμὸν ἔδυνε is not a Homeric expression, στήθεσσιν ἔδυνε(v) *is*, always occurring (as here) at the line-end, albeit in an entirely different context: δεύτερον αὖ θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσιν ἔδυνε(v)! It occurs at Iliad 3.332, 11.19, 16.133, 19.371. In other words, either this text or (more probably) one of its ancestors may have been produced by someone who was so familiar with Homeric formulae that the word στήθεσσιν in this position automatically conjured up in his mind its sequel ἔδυνε by means of a sort of Pavlovian conditioned reflex, even though this was actually the wrong response to the stimulus in this particular context – an error showing that our Homerist was no virtuoso.

To complete our apparatus criticus we need to add that there is one more variant at the end of this line, read by another papyrus, although the precise form of that variant is less than crystal-clear. The papyrus is West's Pap. 363, = Pap. 363 Collart + 397 Mette + 569 Sutton (first century A.D.). What exactly is the variant? West has done well to ignore the longstanding error that it is the nonsensical ο[ρι]πε: that is impossible, not primarily because it would be nonsense, but because there is space within the lacuna for exactly one more standard-sized letter, and because the first letter of the word is not ο but ε, whose cross-bar is clearly visible. To ascertain both these points – evidently appreciated by West – one needs to inspect and study the photograph accompanying the 1984 publication of P.Hamb. 3.196 (Tafel I Nr. 196), which includes the ε just before the short lacuna (wrongly transcribed as ο by the editors), together with the photograph accompanying Lameere's de luxe edition of P.Bru. E. 7344 (Planche 2), which includes the πε immediately after the lacuna (W. Lameere, *Aperçus de paléographie homérique*, Paris, Brussels, Anvers and Amsterdam 1960, 65-92, esp. 70-71). West fills in the lacuna so as to produce ε[γει]ρε. This is eminently plausible, since the phrase θυμὸν --- ἔγειρε is Homeric enough (cf. Iliad 5.510 Τρωσὶν θυμὸν ἐγείραι) and ἔγειρε occurs as a variant for ὄρινε (albeit where ὄρινε has a different sense) at the end of Iliad 24.760 in Allen's Pap. 14 (second century A.D.) and 13 of his minuscules; and it is also possible that ἔγειρε at Iliad 4.208 entered the text via a gloss: cf. Schol. D ad loc. ὄρινεν· διετάραξεν, διήγειρεν (see p. 178 of van Thiel's Internet edition of the D scholia: cf. ZPE 132, 2000, 1-62). However, other possibilities might be ε[τει]ρε, “distressed his heart” (cf. Iliad 22.242 ἀλλ' ἐμὸς ἐνδοθι θυμὸς ἐτείρετο πένθει λυγρῷ or

ε[πει]  
“strike  
mitte  
ἔγειρε  
establ  
manus

209

is MI  
is also  
micro  
result  
centur  
switch  
space  
longer

209

(210)

211

οσοι,  
prece  
the otl  
The

the la  
faithfu  
ευμε  
θεσ]σ  
one-si

212

my M  
ρος. I  
collati  
= All  
sumat  
relieve  
vulgar

112/80

I h  
Ludwi  
and vi  
shorte  
major  
found  
(s. ix)

ἐ[πει]ρε, “pierced his heart” (pain or grief in Homer can be “sharp” and can “strike”, e.g. *Iliad* 19.125 τὸν δ’ ἄχος ὁξὺ κατὰ φρένα τύψε βαθείαν), but admittedly these would both be more awkward with the personal subject than ἔγειρε. However, ὄρινε is almost certainly the true Homeric text: it is a well-established element of an elaborate formulaic system and has overwhelming manuscript support.

**209** Allen lists five of his mediaeval MSS as reading βῆ for βάν. One of them is M11. This is incorrect: M11 reads βάν. But he omits M5 from his βῆ list. This is also incorrect: M5 does in fact read βῆ. (I have collated both these MSS in microfiche; for the source of Allen’s confusion see ZPE 82, 1990, 19.) But the net result is that we still have five MSS with βῆ. Their dates range from the thirteenth century to the fifteenth. As βῆ is perhaps semantically defensible (in spite of the switch to the plural in 210) it may be worth pointing out that considerations of space strongly suggest that P.Alex. did *not* have the shorter βῆ but rather the longer βάν.

**209-10** For the spelling ομειλ[ο]ν for ὄμιλον (209) and εικανον for ἵκανον (210) see above on 190.

**211** At the very edge of P.Berol., above and slightly to the left of the initial ο of οσοι, is a short stroke which seems likely to be part of an apostrophe after the preceding θ at the end of αγηγεραθ]. It seems compatible with the form taken by the other apostrophes in this papyrus, in lines 34, 38 and 218.

The single sigma in οσοι (for ὄσσοι) would seem to be an aberration even by the lax standards of this scribe: elsewhere Homeric double consonants seem to be faithfully reproduced: 32 τοσσα, 40 οπποτε, 160 ετελεσσεν, 162 τεκεεσσι, 165 ευμελιωι (sic), 193 οττι, and apparently also 167 επισσειησιν and 208 στηθεσ]σιν. Pap. 172 (for details of which see above on 196-7 ad init., (b)) also has a one-sigma οσοι in 211.

**213** [αυτικά δ εκ ζ]ωστηρος: Allen’s Pap. 4 (apparently first century A.D.: see my MS Evidence [above, n. 8] p. 30 n. 7) omits εκ and writes simply δε ζωστηρος. No editor cites any other diplomatic support for this reading, but my own collations have revealed that it is also read by Ambrosianus 486 (L73 sup., = Allen’s M10 = Ludwich’s Dd, s. xiii-xiv). However, since readers will presumably agree that this is unlikely to be what Homer sang, they will doubtless be relieved to learn that considerations of space strongly suggest that P.Alex. had the vulgate reading δ εκ, which is also read by West’s Pap. 961 (P.Ashm. inv. 112/8(a), date not stated) and, as far as is known, by the rest of the paradosis.

I have printed ελκεν (= ἔλκεν) within the lacuna, with Aristarchus, Allen, Ludwich, Leaf and La Roche, rather than ειλκεν (= εἰλκεν), with West, van Thiel and van Leeuwen, because on balance considerations of space tend to favour the shorter ελκεν here. According to Didymus ἔλκεν was to be found in “the majority” (οἱ πλείους) of Aristarchus’ MSS (Schol. A Δ 213b1 Erbse). It is also found in Pap. 172 (for which see on 196-7 above), in West’s (= van Thiel’s) Z (s. ix) and in a dozen other MSS ranging from the twelfth century to the fifteenth.

West, on the basis of his own collation, reports that Pap. 4 Allen has εἶλκεν "ut videtur"; this is also the reading of the vast majority of our minuscules.

For the spelling ο]ειστον for οἰστόν see above on 190.

P.Berol.

This p.  
*Latin 1*  
66. Th  
catalog  
severa

Of t  
come  
not be  
numbe  
beginn  
the foc

The  
simila  
P.Berol  
*Early*  
centur  
appro  
BKT  
Herm  
rolls c

Lit  
epic  
sectio  
vv. 5

Th  
end in  
accen  
noted  
provi

11  
Januar  
access  
2p